arXiv:1412.8693v3 [math.MG] 1 Sep 2015

THE ASYMMETRY OF COMPLETE AND CONSTANT WIDTH BODIES IN GENERAL NORMED SPACES AND THE JUNG CONSTANT

RENÉ BRANDENBERG AND BERNARDO GONZÁLEZ MERINO

Abstract. In this paper we state a one-to-one connection between the maximal ratio of the circumradius and the diameter of a body (the Jung constant) in an arbitrary Minkowski space and the maximal Minkowski asymmetry of the complete bodies within that space. This allows to generalize and unify recent results on complete bodies and to derive a necessary condition on the unit ball of the space, assuming a given body to be complete. Finally, we state several corollaries, e. g. concerning the Helly dimension or the Banach-Mazur distance.

1. Introduction

A bounded set in a Minkowski space (a finite dimensional real normed space) is called (diametrically) complete if it cannot be enlarged without increasing its diameter. In Euclidean spaces and in planar Minkowski spaces the complete sets are precisely the sets of constant width, while in arbitrary Minkowski spaces every constant width set is complete, but the converse is not true in general (cf. [18]). Actually, the norms of Minkowski spaces in which all complete sets are of constant width are called perfect and characterizing such spaces and norms is still a major open task in convex geometry (cf. [18, 39]) and in functional analysis ([15] shows that norms of general Hilbert spaces are perfect, and [38] studies properties of perfect norms in infinite dimensional Banach spaces).

There exists a rich variety of asymmetry measures for convex sets (see [26, Sect. 6] for the possibly most comprehensive overview) but amongst all, the one receiving most attention is the *Minkowski asymmetry* $s(K)$, which may be expressed as the smallest dilatation factor needed to cover the origin mirrored set $-K = \{-x : x \in K\}$ of a set K by a homothetic of K itself. In mathematical terms:

$$s(K) := \inf\{\rho > 0 : \exists\, c \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ s. t. } -(K-c) \subset \rho(K-c)\}, \tag{1}$$

and if $-(K-c) \subset s(K)(K-c)$ then c is called the *Minkowski center* of K.

It is an easy consequence of the Blaschke Selection Theorem (see e. g. [45]) that this infimum is attained and the same holds true for all other infima or suprema in the following.

It is well known [26] and easy to show that $1 \leq s(K) \leq n$ with equality in the left inequality iff K is symmetric and equality in the right inequality iff K is a fulldimensional simplex.

For polytopes (presented by their vertices or their facets) the Minkowski asymmetry can be computed via Linear Programming (see [4] or [14, Lemma 3.5]). Hence, involving this asymmetry has not only theoretical interest but is useful in computations, too (cf. [13]).

The question of finding the most asymmetric sets of constant width is a well known topic of study (see, e. g. [28] for the Minkowski asymmetry or [19, Theorem 56] for the asymmetry of Besicovitch). For the Minkowski asymmetry of constant width sets K in Euclidean spaces recently the following inequality has been derived in [28]:

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 52A20; Secondary 52A40, 52A21.

Key words and phrases. Asymmetry measures, Banach-Mazur Distance, Constant Width, Completions, Geometric Inequalities, Helly dimension, Jung Constant, Minkowski Asymmetry, Radii, Perfect Norms.

The second author was partially supported by MINECO/FEDER project reference MTM2012-34037, Spain.

$$s(K) \leq \frac{n+\sqrt{2n(n+1)}}{n+2}, \tag{2}$$

leaving the characterization of the equality case open, which then is solved separately in [27]: Equality in (2) holds, iff K is a completion of an n-dimensional regular simplex.
This result was the starting motivation for the present paper. In [46] Schneider says "as a rule, the first step [...] consists in optimizing a proof of the inequality to make the identification of the equality cases as easy as possible". We believe our work leads into this direction.
Geometric inequalities relating different radii of convex bodies like the circumradius $R(K)$ and the diameter $D(K)$ form a central area of research in convex geometry. The upper bounds for the ratio of the circumradius and the diameter by Jung [34] (for Euclidean space)

$$R(K)/D(K) \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}} \tag{3}$$

and Bohnenblust [8] (for arbitrary Minkowski spaces)

$$R(K)/D(K) \leq \frac{n}{n+1} \tag{4}$$

are famous, widely studied and have been object of many improvements and extensions (e. g. in [7, 8, 13, 14, 31, 34]).
Explicitely mentioning [9], in many classical works in convexity, significant parts are devoted to geometric inequalities among the basic radii (see [8, 35, 44, 50]), generalizations ([6, 12, 21, 31, 42]), and between radii and other functionals ([5, 10, 32]).
In recent years both, Jung's inequality as well as the Minkowski asymmetry have drawn renewed attention. Jung's inequality has been generalized and improved in several ways (see, e. g., [7, 13, 31]). In [46] the Minkowski asymmetry has been used as a parameter for improving geometric inequalities and in [4, 30] especially as a connection between a geometric inequality and its restricted version to symmetric sets. Fundamental results used in the present paper stem from [14]. There, besides others, sharpened versions of Jung's and Bohnenblust's inequalities involving the Minkowski asymmetry have been derived (see Proposition 2.2 below), which are of major interest here, too.
The main result we obtain is a one-to-one relation between the maximal Minkowski asymmetry of complete bodies within a given Minkowski space $\mathbb{M}^n = (\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$ and the *Jung constant* $j(\mathbb{M}^n)$ of the same space, which measures the maximal ratio between the circumradius and the diameter of arbitrary bodies in that space.

Theorem 1.1. *For any Minkowski space $\mathbb{M}^n$ and K complete within $\mathbb{M}^n$ it holds*

$$s(K) \leq \frac{j(\mathbb{M}^n)}{1-j(\mathbb{M}^n)},$$

and for any K complete within $\mathbb{M}^n$ it holds $s(K) = \frac{j(\mathbb{M}^n)}{1-j(\mathbb{M}^n)}$, iff K is the completion of an n-simplex S with circumradius-diameter ratio $j(\mathbb{M}^n)$.

Defining the *asymmetry constant* $s(\mathbb{M}^n)$ of a Minkowski space $\mathbb{M}^n$ by $s(\mathbb{M}^n) := \max\{s(K) : K \text{ complete}\}$, Theorem 1.1 simply says that $s(\mathbb{M}^n) = \frac{j(\mathbb{M}^n)}{1-j(\mathbb{M}^n)}$ or $j(\mathbb{M}^n) = \frac{s(\mathbb{M}^n)}{s(\mathbb{M}^n)+1}$.
This does not only reprove inequality (2) and its equality case (as to be seen below in a simpler, less technical way), it also generalizes it to arbitrary Minkowski spaces and therefore allows to unify several results seemingly not related and thus generalizing and strengthening them. The base of this unification lies in the understanding of the direct interplay of two

geometric inequalities belonging to the Jung-constant and completeness, which are studied in [13] and [14].

Before going into details, some necessary notation has to be stated:
For any $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we write $\mathrm{lin}(A)$, $\mathrm{aff}(A)$, and $\mathrm{conv}(A)$ for the *linear*, *affine*, and *convex hull* of A, respectively, and abbreviate by $[x,y] := \mathrm{conv}(\{x,y\})$ the line segment with endpoints $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
For any $\rho > 0$ and $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ let $A + B := \{a + b : a \in A,\, b \in B\}$ denote the *Minkowski sum* of A and B and $\rho A := \{\rho a : a \in A\}$ the *ρ-dilatation* of A, abbreviating $-A := (-1)A$.
We use $\mathbb{B}$ to denote the unit ball of a Minkowski space $\mathbb{M}^n$ and in case the the Minkowski space is a Euclidean space, we write $\mathbb{E}^n = (\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_2)$ and $\mathbb{B}_2$ for the Euclidean unit ball.
A *(convex) body* is a set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ that is convex and compact. Let $\mathcal{K}^n$ be the family of bodies $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathcal{K}^n_0$ its subset formed by centrally symmetric sets, i. e., when $K = -K$. All along the paper we refer by S to an n-dimensional simplex and by T if the simplex is regular (in the Euclidean sense).
For any two sets, we write $A \subset_t B$ (resp. $A =_t B$) to denote that there exists a translation vector c such that $A \subset c + B$ (resp. $A = c + B$) and abbreviate by $A \subset^{opt} B$ that $A \subset B$, but $A \not\subset_t \rho B$ for any $\rho < 1$.
Now, the *outer radius* or *circumradius* $R(K)$ of $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is

$$R(K) := \inf\{\rho > 0 : K \subset_t \rho\mathbb{B}\} = \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sup_{x \in K} \|x - c\|$$

(see e. g. [23]) and any $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, s. t. $K \subset c + R(K)\mathbb{B}$ is called a *circumcenter* of K.
Analogously, the *inradius* $r(K)$ is defined as $r(K) := \sup\{\rho > 0 : \rho\mathbb{B} \subset_t K\}$ and any $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, s. t. $c + r(K)\mathbb{B} \subset K$ is called an *incenter* of K. The *diameter* $D(K)$ of K is defined as $D(K) := 2\sup_{x,y \in K} R([x,y]) = \sup_{x,y \in K} \|x - y\|$ and the *Jung ratio* as $j(K) := R(K)/D(K)$. Using the *support function* of a convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $h(K, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, $h(K,u) = \sup_{x \in K} u^T x$, the width $w(K)$ of K can be defined as $w(K) = \inf_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}} \frac{h(K-K,u)}{h(\mathbb{B},u)} = \inf_{u \in \mathbb{S}^*} h(K - K, u)$, where $\mathbb{S}^*$ denotes the dual unit sphere.
A set $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is said to be of *constant width*, if $w(K) = \frac{h(K-K,u)}{h(\mathbb{B},u)}$, independently of the choice of u. It is well known that K is of constant width, iff $w(K) = D(K)$, or iff $K - K = D(K)\mathbb{B}$ [18, (A)]. A set K is called *complete* if $D(K \cup \{x\}) > D(K)$ for all $x \notin K$ and a set $K^* \supset K$ is a *completion* of K if K^* is complete and $D(K^*) = D(K)$. If it also holds that $R(K^*) = R(K)$, i. e. K and K^* possess a common circumball, then we say K^* is a *Scott completion* of K. Indeed, in [47] the existence of Scott completions is proved for the Euclidean case and with almost the same proof [51] shows the same for general Minkowski spaces. We say a set K is *pseudo-complete* if there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ s. t. $c + (D(K) - R(K))\mathbb{B} \subset K \subset c + R(K)\mathbb{B}$ and for any circumcenter c of K, the set $K^+ := \mathrm{conv}\{K \cup (c + (D(K) - R(K))\mathbb{B})\}$ is called a *pseudo-completion* of K.
The subsets of $\mathcal{K}^n$ of all complete bodies and all bodies of constant width are abbreviated by $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}$, respectively.
As mentioned in the introduction, it is well-known (see e.g. [18]) that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}} \subset \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}}$ in the planar case or for $\mathbb{E}^n$. Unfortunately, this is not the case in general Minkowski spaces when $n \geq 3$ (as pointed out in [18] and [36]). For instance, let $\mathbb{M}^n$ be a Minkowski space with indecomposable unit ball $\mathbb{B}$, i. e. for all $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\mathbb{B} = K + L$, there exist $\lambda, \mu \geq 0$, s. t. $\lambda K =_t \mu L =_t \mathbb{B}$ (cf. [45]). An example for the latter is if $\mathbb{B}$ is the unit crosspolytope. From the indecomposabilty it follows on the one side that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}} = \{\rho\mathbb{B} + t : \rho \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ (as $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}$ iff $K - K = D(K)\mathbb{B}$) and on the other side it is well known [20, 48] and can easily be followed from Theorem 1.1 that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}} = \{\rho\mathbb{B} + t : \rho \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ holds, iff $\mathbb{B}$ is a parallelotope (a highly decomposable set).

In [18, p. 125] (for the Euclidean case) and [39, Theorem 2] (for general Minkowski spaces) inequalities lower bounding the ratio between the inradius and the diameter of complete sets were derived. Let $\mathbb{M}^n$ be a Minkowski space and $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\rm cp}$. Then

$$\frac{r(K)}{D(K)} \geq \frac{1}{n+1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{r(K)}{D(K)} \geq 1 - \sqrt{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}}, \text{ if } \mathbb{M}^n = \mathbb{E}^n. \tag{5}$$

Equality holds in the first, if K is an n-simplex and $\mathbb{B} = K - K$, and in the second inequality, iff K is a completion of a regular n-simplex. In the proof of the general inequality above, Moreno and Schneider used that for any complete set K it holds $r(K) + R(K) = D(K)$. Involving the Minkowski asymmetry we will not only reprove the inequalities and the equation $r(K) + R(K) = D(K)$ above, but reveal a deeper relation for these radii for complete sets which also allows to generalize the bound to arbitrary *fixed* Minkowski spaces:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathbb{M}^n$ be a Minkowski space and $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\rm cp}$. Then it holds*

$$(s(K)+1)r(K) = r(K) + R(K) = \frac{s(K)+1}{s(K)} R(K) = D(K),$$

and therefore

$$\frac{r(K)}{D(K)} = 1 - j(K) \geq 1 - j(\mathbb{M}^n)$$

with equality, iff $j(K) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$.

Moreover, the same relations also allow to formulate conditions on the space $\mathbb{M}^n$ if given a *fixed* $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ chosen to be complete:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and 0 a Minkowski center of K. Then $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\rm cp}$ implies the following condition on the unit ball $\mathbb{B}$ of $\mathbb{M}^n$:*

$$K - K \subset D(K)\mathbb{B} \subset (s(K)+1)(K \cap (-K)).$$

If in addition K is a fulldimensional simplex, then either $\mathcal{K}_{\rm cw} = \{\rho\mathbb{B} + t : \rho \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ or $K - K = D(K)\mathbb{B}$ (and therefore $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\rm cw}$).

2. Pseudo-completeness and completeness

The following proposition is taken from [14, Corollary 6.3]:

Proposition 2.1. *For any Minkowski space and any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ it holds*

$$w(K) \leq (s(K)+1)r(K) \leq r(K) + R(K) \leq \frac{s(K)+1}{s(K)} R(K) \leq D(K).$$

Proposition 2.1 also allows an immeadiate corollary, summarizing two inequalities we need later.

Corollary 2.2. *For any Minkowski space and any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ it holds*

$$j(K) \leq \frac{s(K)}{s(K)+1}, \tag{6}$$

and

$$\frac{r(K)}{D(K)} \leq \frac{1}{s(K)+1}, \tag{7}$$

In particular (6) sharpens (4), (but has been restricted to Minkowski space from [14, Theorem 4.1]), while (7) generalizes and sharpens an inequality for Euclidean space of Alexander (see [1] and cf. [14, Corollary 6.4]).
Particularizing in $\mathbb{E}^n$, (6) also leads to a sharpening of Jung's inequality (3) (cf. [14, Corollary 5.1]):

Proposition 2.3. *In Euclidean spaces $\mathbb{E}^n$ it holds*

$$j(K) \leq \min\left\{\sqrt{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}}, \frac{s(K)}{s(K)+1}\right\}$$

for any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$.

One should remark that the inequality above is fulfilled with equality for both values inside the minimum *at the same time* iff $\operatorname{conv}\{T \cup \frac{1}{s(T^*)}(-T)\} \subset K \subset T^*$.
Directly contained within the inequality chain in Proposition 2.1 is the inequality

$$R(K) + r(K) \leq D(K), \tag{8}$$

which we want to investigate closer in the remainder of this section. It has been proven in [44] for the Euclidean case and $n = 2$ and in [11] for arbitrary n. Eventhough it follows from Proposition 2.1 for general Minkowski spaces we want to present an easy direct proof from which we extract the fact that any set attaining equality in (8) must have some common in- and circumcenters.

Lemma 2.4. *For any Minkowski space $\mathbb{M}^n$ and any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ it holds $R(K)+r(K) \leq D(K)$ and if $R(K)+r(K) = D(K)$ any incenter of K is also a circumcenter.*

Proof. For showing the inequality, assume w. l. o. g. that 0 is an incenter of K. Since there exists a point in K which is at least at distance $R(K)$ from the incenter, there must be some $p \in \operatorname{bd}(\mathbb{B})$ and $\rho \geq R(K)$, s. t. $\rho p \in K$. But, since $r(K)\mathbb{B} \subset K$, we also have $r(K)(-p) \in K$ and therefore $D(K) \geq \|\rho p - (-r(K)p)\| \geq R(K) + r(K)$.
The concentricity statement then follows directly from the necessity of $\|\rho p - (-r(K)p)\| = R(K) + r(K)$, which means there is no point at a distance bigger than $R(K)$ from any incenter. □

It was shown in [39] (by combining results from [18] and [43]) that (8) holds with equality for any $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}}$. The converse is in general not true, but the equality case of (8) plays a major role in understanding completions and inequalities concerning them. The following lemma now completely characterizes this equality case (partially it is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.1).

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\mathbb{M}^n$ be a Minkowski space and $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) $D(K) = r(K) + R(K)$,
(ii) K *is pseudo-complete with respect to* $\mathbb{B}$,
(iii) $D(K) = (s(K)+1)r(K)$ *(equality case in Theorem 1.2), and*
(iv) for every incenter c of K it holds $K - K \subset D(K)\mathbb{B} \subset (s(K)+1)((K-c) \cap (-(K-c)))$.

Proof of Lemma 2.5. In view of Theorem 1.2 either (i) or (iii) implies $R(K) = s(K)r(K)$ and therefore the other.
Since $D(K) = R(K-K)$ we have that (iii) (or (i)) implies:

$$K - K \subset R(K-K)\mathbb{B} = D(K)\mathbb{B} = (s(K)+1)r(K)\mathbb{B} \subset (s(K)+1)(K-c).$$

However, since $K - K$ is symmetric, we then also have $K - K \subset (s(K)+1)(-(K-c))$ and therefore (iv).
Now, observe that (iv) implies $D(K)\mathbb{B} \subset (s(K)+1)(K-c)$ and therefore $r(K) \geq D(K)/(s(K)+1)$. Together with Proposition 2.1 we obtain (iii).
Next we show (i) implies (ii): From Lemma 2.4 we know that (i) means that K has a common in- and circumcenter c, and therefore $c + (D(K) - R(K))\mathbb{B} \subset K \subset c + R(K)\mathbb{B}$, which means K is pseudo-complete.
Finally, (ii) together with (8) directly implies (i).

□

Remark 2.6. *a) Lemma 2.5 implies that K is pseudo-complete iff K attains equality in* (8)*. Also taking Proposition 2.1 into account we see that pseudo-completeness also implies equality in* (6)*, but the converse is in general not true (as e. g.* $\operatorname{conv}\{T \cup \frac{1}{s(T^*)}(-T)\}$ *is not pseudo-complete in Euclidean space, but fulfills equality in Proposition 2.3).*
b) As said above, if K is complete it fulfills $D(K) = r(K) + R(K)$, and thus every complete K is pseudo-complete.

The following Lemma collects some facts for pseudo-completions and completions.

Lemma 2.7. *a) If $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and K^+ a pseudo-completion of K, then $R(K^+) = R(K)$ and $D(K^+) = D(K)$.*
b) If K is pseudo-complete and K^* a completion of K, then $R(K^*) = R(K)$, $r(K^*) = r(K)$ and $s(K^*) = s(K)$.

Proof. a) Without loss of generality we may assume that 0 is a circumcenter of K and $K^+ = \operatorname{conv}\{(D(K) - R(K))\mathbb{B} \cup K\}$. Obviously $K^+ \subset R(K)\mathbb{B}$, which means by the monotonicity of R that $R(K^+) = R(K)$. Moreover, since K^+ is pseudo-complete, we know from Lemma 2.5 that $D(K^+) = r(K^+)+R(K^+) = D(K)-R(K)+R(K^+) = D(K)$.
b) Since both sets are pseudo-complete, we have $r(K) + R(K) = D(K) = D(K^*) = r(K^*) + R(K^*)$, which means because of set monotonicity that $R(K^*) = R(K)$ and $r(K^*) = r(K)$. Finally, $s(K^*) = s(K)$ follows from Lemma 2.5 (iii).

□

As an easy consequence we obtain a reproof of the existence of Scott completions for general Minkowski spaces only relying on the existence of arbitrary completions:

Corollary 2.8. *Let $\mathbb{M}^n$ be a Minkowski space with unit ball $\mathbb{B}$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Then there exists a Scott completion K^* of K.*

Proof. Let K^+ be any pseudo-completion of K and $(K^+)^*$ be any completion of K^+, which by [25] always exists and obviously is a completion of K too. Now, from taking both parts of Lemma 2.7 together, we obtain $R(K) = R(K^+) = R((K^+)^*)$. □

Even though every complete body K is pseudo-complete, the converse is in general not true. Because of this the case in which K is a pseudo-complete simplex deserves special attention.

Lemma 2.9. *Any simplex S has a unique Minkowski center c and $S - S$ touches all facets of $(n+1)((S-c) \cap (-(S-c)))$ with a full facet of its own.*

Proof. The uniqueness of the Minkowski center c of any simplex follows directly from the optimality conditions for containment under homothetics [13, Theorem 2.3]. Now w. l. o. g., let S be regular and $c = 0$. Moreover, suppose that $S = \operatorname{conv}\{p^1, \dots, p^{n+1}\}$ and let $F_i = \operatorname{conv}\{p^k : k \neq i\}$ denote the opposing facet to p^i in S.
Then for any fixed $j \in [n+1]$ it holds $F_j - p^j$ is a facet of $S - S$ with vertices $p^i - p^j$, $i \in [n+1]$, $i \neq j$. Now, $-p^j = \sum_{k \neq j} p^k \in nF_j$ and thus $p^i - p^j \in (n+1)F_j$, $i \in [n+1], i \neq j$, and since $p^i - p^j \in (n+1)(-F_i) \subset (n+1)(-S)$, we obtain $F_j - p^j \subset (n+1)(F_j \cap (-S))$ □

Corollary 2.10. *Let $\mathbb{M}^n$ be a Minkowski space and S an n-simplex. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) S is complete with respect to $\mathbb{B}$.
(ii) $D(S) = r(S) + R(S)$.
(iii) $S - S \subset D(S)\mathbb{B} \subset (n+1)((S-c) \cap (-(S-c)))$, where c is the (unique) incenter of S.
(iv) $j(S) = n/(n+1)$ (which means equality in (4)*).*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2.5 that (ii) and (iii) are equivalent and that (i) implies either of them. That (iii) characterizes the equality case in (4) (and thus is equivalent to (iv)) is shown in [35].
In order to show (iii) implies (i), we may assume w. l. o. g. that $c = 0$. Now, let $x \notin S$ and denote the facet of S separating x from S by F_i and the vertex of S not in F_i by p^i. Then $p^i \in -nF_i \subset \mathrm{bd}(-nS)$ and $x \notin S$. Thus $p^i - x \notin -(n+1)S \supset D(S)\mathbb{B}$. Hence $D(S \cup \{x\}) > D(S)$, proving that S must be complete. □

Putting all together we are ready to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The statement about the unit balls belonging to general complete K follows directly from Lemma 2.5 in conjunction with Remark 2.6 (b).
Now, consider the part about the case when K is an n-simplex. Since $s(K) = n$ we have $K - K \subset D(K)\mathbb{B} \subset (n+1)(K \cap (-K))$. Assuming $K' \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}$ with $D(K') = D(K)$ it follows $K' - K' = D(K)\mathbb{B} \supset K - K$ and if $K' - K' \neq K - K$ there exist $x \in K' \setminus K$. Using the same argument as in the step from (iii) to(i) in Corollary 2.10, we see that $p^i - x \in K' - K' \setminus (n+1)(K \cap (-K))$, contradicting $K' - K' = D(K)\mathbb{B} \subset (n+1)(K \cap (-K))$. Thus $K - K = D(K)\mathbb{B}$ or $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}} = \{\rho\mathbb{B} + t : \rho \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$. □

Remark 2.11. *a) While* $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}} = \{\rho\mathbb{B} + t : \rho \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ *obviously implies* $\max_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}} s(K) = 1$*, it follows from the last lemma in* [20] *that at least for* $n = 3$ *in case of a simplex being of constant width, there exists another simplex* S'*, s. t.* S' *is complete with respect to* $\mathbb{B}$ *but not of constant width. Thus in both cases with a complete simplex, it holds* $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}} \neq \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}$ *(at least) in 3-space, but while in the first* $\max_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}} s(K) = 1$ *in the latter* $\max_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}} s(K) = s(\mathbb{M}^n) = n$*.*
b) One should recognize that the existence of a simplex $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *such that Property* (iii) *of Corollary 2.10 is fulfilled with* $\mathbb{B}$ *being a regular crosspolytope is by* [17] *equivalent to the existence of an* $(n+1)$*-dimensional Hadamard matrix.*

Lemma 2.12. *Let* $\mathbb{M}^n$ *be a Minkowski-space. Then*

$$j(\mathbb{M}^n) = \max_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}}} j(K) \tag{9}$$

and for any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ *with* $j(K) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$ *and any completion* K^* *of* K *there exists an* n*-simplex* $S \subset K$ *s. t.* $D(S) = D(K) = D(K^*)$ *and* $R(S) = R(K) = R(K^*)$*.*

Proof. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $j(K) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$ and K^* an arbitrary completion of K. We obtain $D(K^*) = D(K)$ and $R(K^*) \geq R(K)$ and thus $j(K^*) \geq j(K) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$, which means $j(K^*) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$ and therefore $R(K^*) = R(K)$.
Now, due to Helly's theorem there always exists an n-simplex $S \subset K$, s. t. $R(S) = R(K)$ (cf. 2.17) and surely it holds $D(S) \leq D(K)$ and therefore $j(S) \geq j(K) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$. Again it directly follows $j(S) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$ and $D(S) = D(K)$. □

Observe that we implicitely showed in the proof of Lemma 2.12 that every completion of a set K attaining equality in (9) is a Scott completion.
Lemma 2.12 implies that there always exists some simplex S with $j(S) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$. On the other hand $j(K) \geq 1/2$ for all K, with equality if $K = -K$. Hence j may be understood a kind of asymmetry measure, too – one that depends on the Minkowski space it is measured in. In this it differs from the Minkowsky asymmetry, but measuring asymmetry with respect to the way distances are measured within the space makes a certain sense to us.

Taking together the above results we may now prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. It follows from Remark 2.6 (a) that $j(K) = s(K)/(s(K)+1)$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}}$. Now, maximizing over $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}}$ on both sides, we obtain from (9) that $j(\mathbb{M}^n) = s(\mathbb{M}^n)/(s(\mathbb{M}^n)+1)$.
The characterization of the equality case then is a direct corollary of that in Lemma 2.12.
Every $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}}$ implies the conditions in Lemma 2.5 and thus equality in all but the first inequality of Proposition 2.1. The second follows from $D(K) = (s(K)+1)r(K)$ and $s(K) \leq s(\mathbb{M}^n)$, with equality iff $s(K) = s(\mathbb{M}^n)$, which by $j(K) = s(K)/(s(K)+1)$ and $j(\mathbb{M}^n) = s(\mathbb{M}^n)/(s(\mathbb{M}^n)+1)$ occurs iff $j(K) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$.

□

Remark 2.13. *Surely Theorem 1.1 holds valid if we enlarge the class of complete to pseudo-complete sets. Indeed the proof only relies in the equality condition of* (8).
Moreover, an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1 is that the Jung ratio of a (pseudo-) complete set only depends on the Minkowski space in the way that the set has to be (pseudo-) complete, but not in its value. This means, if a set K is (pseudo-) complete in two different spaces the Jung ratio $j(K)$ stays constant. (Remember that we may interpret Condition (iv) *of 2.5 as a characterization of the unit ball of the spaces in which K is pseudo-complete.)*

Applying Theorem 1.1 we obtain some direct but important corollaries.
Corollary 2.14 does not only imply (2), but also answers the question in [28] (which was answered separately in [27]) about a characterization of the "only if case" (and so does Theorem 1.1 even for general Minkowski spaces). Recall that if $n = 2$ then T^* (a completion of the regular simplex) equals the *Reuleaux triangle* and in case that $n = 3$ has as particular examples the two *Meissner bodies* (see [9] for a detailed construction and basic properties).

Corollary 2.14. *In Euclidean space it holds*

$$s(\mathbb{E}^n) = \frac{j(\mathbb{E}^n)}{1 - j(\mathbb{E}^n)} = \frac{n + \sqrt{2n(n+1)}}{n+2},$$

and for $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}$ it holds $s(K) = s(\mathbb{E}^n)$ if and only if K is the completion T^* of a regular simplex.

Proof. The first statement follows directly from combining Jung's inequality (3) and Theorem 1.1, the second afterwards from combining Proposition 2.3, Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 2.12. □

Similar studies have been recently done in [33] for sets of revolution (around an axis of symmetry). As corollaries of (2) and Theorem 1.1 we provide simplified proofs for [33, Theorem 1 and Theorem 2].

Corollary 2.15. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ be a body of revolution in $\mathbb{E}^n$. Then*

$$s(K) \leq 2 \quad \textit{and} \quad s(K) \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}+1}{2}, \ \textit{if } K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}},$$

with equality in the first inequality iff K is the body of revolution of an isosceles triangle and in the second iff K is the body of revolution of a Reuleaux triangle.

Proof. Let e^i be the *i-th* unit vector, $L = \mathrm{lin}(\{e^1\})$, $F = \mathrm{lin}(\{e^1, e^2\})$, and assume K to be a body of revolution around L. Furthermore by $K|F$ we denote the orthogonal projection of K onto F.
First observe that in general for any body of revolution K around L it obviously holds that $-K \subset_t \rho K$ iff $-K|F \subset_t \rho K|F$ for all $\rho \geq 0$. Thus $s(K) = s(K|F)$.
Now $K|F$ is always a 2-dimensional set and thus $s(K|F) \leq 2$, with equality iff $K|F$ is a triangle (axially symmetric with respect to L because of K being a body of revolution).

Hence $s(K|F) = 2$ holds iff $K|F$ is an isosceles triangle possessing one vertex in L and the other two symmetric with respect to L.
Finally, assuming that K is of constant width also $K|F$ is of constant width and it follows from Corollary 2.14

$$s(K|F) \leq s(\mathbb{E}^2) = \frac{\sqrt{3}+1}{2}$$

and that equality holds iff $K|F$ is the completion of a regular simplex – i. e. it must be a Reuleaux triangle – symmetric with respect to L. □

Remark 2.16. *One may easily extend Corollary 2.15 by assuming that K is a body of revolution around an i-dimensional subspace L. More formally let $L^\perp$ denote the orthogonal subspace of L, then $K = \{x|L + \|x - x|L\|_2 (\mathbb{B}_2 \cap L^\perp) : x \in K\}$. In this case $s(K) \leq i+1$, with equality for any set of revolution of an $(i+1)$-dimensional simplex symmetric with respect to L. Analogously, if $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}$, again the bound may be improved using Corollary 2.14 to $s(K) \leq s(\mathbb{E}^{i+1}) = \frac{i+1+\sqrt{2(i+1)(i+2)}}{i+3}$, with equality for the body of revolution around L of any completion K^* of an $(i+1)$-dimensional regular simplex with i vertices in L and the other two symmetric with respect to L, s. t. K^* keeps symmetric around L (which can be ensured by taking $\frac{1}{2}(K_1^* + K_2^*)$, if K_1^* is an arbitrary completion of the regular simplex within any $(i+1)$-space containing L and K_2^* is its mirrored with respect to L.*

In a Helly-type theorem there is usually a family of objects $\mathcal{F}$, a property Π and a number $h \in \mathbb{N}$, s. t. if every subfamily $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ with $|\mathcal{S}| = h$ possesses property Π, then $\mathcal{F}$ has property Π. The classical theorem of Helly deals with the case when $\mathcal{F}$ is a finite family of convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $h = n+1$, and the property Π is that the sets should have a non-empty intersection. Helly-type theorems play a central role in convex geometry (see, e. g., [2, 3, 16] for an overview on this topic).
A remarkable special case is when $\mathcal{F}$ only consists of translates of one fixed $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ [49]. The *Helly dimension* $\mathrm{him}(K)$ of a set $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is defined as the smallest positive integer number k, s. t. whenever we consider a family of indices $I \neq \emptyset$ with $\bigcap_{i\in J}(x_i + C) \neq \emptyset$, for any $J \subset I$, $|J| \leq k+1$, $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $i \in I$, it already follows $\bigcap_{i\in I}(x_i + C) \neq \emptyset$. For a Minkowski space $\mathbb{M}^n$, we also use $\mathrm{him}(\mathbb{M}^n) := \mathrm{him}(\mathbb{B})$.
The following lemma generalizes [13, Lemma 2.2] (with almost the same proof).

Lemma 2.17. *Let $\mathrm{him}(\mathbb{M}^n) = k \in [n]$. Then $R(K) = \max\{R(L) : L \subset K, |L| \leq k+1\}$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Furthermore, if $\dim(K) \geq k$, then there always exists a k-simplex $S \subset K$, s. t. $R(S) = R(K)$.*

Proof. Let $R_k(K) := \max\{R(L) : L \subset K, |L| \leq k+1\}$ (this is called the *k-th core radius* of K in [13]). Surely, for any $L \subset K$ it follows $R(L) \subset R(K)$ and therefore $R_k(K) \leq R(K)$.
Now, by definition of $R_k(K)$ any $L \subset K$ with $|L| \leq k+1$ can be covered by a copy of $R_k(K)\mathbb{B}$. Hence for all such L it holds $\bigcap_{x\in L}(x - R_k(K)\mathbb{B}) \neq \emptyset$. However, by definition of the Helly dimension and the compactness of K this means that $\bigcap_{x\in K}(x - R_k(K)\mathbb{B}) \neq \emptyset$ and therefore that K can be covered by a copy of $R_k(K)\mathbb{B}$. This means $R_k(K) \geq R(K)$ and altogether it follows $R(K) = R_k(K)$.
Applying Helly's theorem within $\mathrm{aff}(L)$ we may always assume that the set $L \subset K$ with $|L| = k+1$ and $R(L) = R(K)$ is affinely independent. Hence, if $|L| \leq k \leq \dim(K)$, we can complete L to the vertex set of a k-simplex. □

In [7, Corollary 1] Boltyanski and Martini improved Bohnenblust inequality by showing the following:[1]

[1]Observe that the authors used the equivalent notion of minimal dependance.

Proposition 2.18. *For any Minkowski space $\mathbb{M}^n$ it holds*

$$j(\mathbb{M}^n) \leq \frac{\operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^n)}{\operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^n)+1}.$$

Applying Proposition 2.18 one may also obtain that the asymmetry constant and the Helly dimension of any Minkowski space directly bound each other. Moreover, from applying Lemma 2.17 also the equality case can be characterized.

Corollary 2.19. *Let $\mathbb{M}^n$ be a Minkowski space. Then*

$$\lceil s(\mathbb{M}^n) \rceil \leq \operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^n)$$

and $s(\mathbb{M}^n) = \operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^n)$ iff there exists a $\operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^n)$-dimensional simplex S, s. t. $s(S) = s(S^+) = s(S^*)$ for all of its completions S^*. Moreover, in that case it holds $S = S^+ \cap \operatorname{aff}(S)$.

Proof. Since the function $f(x) = x/(x+1)$ is increasing whenever $x > 0$, the claimed inequality follows directly from combining Proposition 2.18 with Theorem 1.1.
Considering the equality case, there exists some $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}}$ with $s(K) = s(\mathbb{M}^n)$ and it follows from Lemma 2.17 that there exists a $\operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^n)$-dimensional simplex $S \subset K$, s. t. $R(S) = R(K)$. Now, $s(K) = s(\mathbb{M}^n)$ implies $j(K) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.12, it follows that $j(S) = j(K)$, $D(K) = D(S)$, and therefore that K is a completion of S. Altogether, $s(S) = s(K)$ is equivalent to $s(\mathbb{M}^n) = \operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^n)$. Finally, since surely $S \cup (D(S) - R(S))\mathbb{B} \subset -s(S)(S \cup (D(S) - R(S))\mathbb{B})$ in general it holds $s(S^+) \leq s(S)$. From $s(S^+) = s(S)$ we then obtain that $s(S^+ \cap \operatorname{aff}(S)) = s(S) = \dim(S)$ and since $R(S) = R(S^+)$ that $S^+ \cap \operatorname{aff}(S) = S$. □

Example 2.20. *Considering e. g. $\mathbb{E}^n$, the inequality in 2.19 can be strict.*
On the other hand, for any given $k \in [n]$ the inequality is sharp with $s(\mathbb{M}^n) = \operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^n) = k$, for instance, if we take $K = S^k \times [0,1]^{n-k}$, where S^k denotes a k-dimensional simplex, and $\mathbb{B} = K - K$.
Especially, it is known that $\operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^n) = 1$ iff $\mathbb{B}$ is a parallelotope (see [49]) and this again is eqivalent to $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cp}} = \{\rho\mathbb{B} + t : \rho \geq 0, t \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ (follows from [18] together with [48]). Corollary 2.19 now says that all this is again equivalent with $s(\mathbb{M}^n) = 1$ or $j(\mathbb{M}^n) = 1/2$.
In case of $s(\mathbb{M}^n) = n$, i. e. by Corollary 2.10 that there exists a simplex S with incenter c, s. t. $S - S \subset D(S)\mathbb{B} \subset (n+1)((S-c) \cap (-(S-c)))$ (and $S = S^+ = S^*$), Corollary 2.19 implies $\operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^n) = n$.
Finally, let $\mathbb{M}^3$ be the space whose unit ball is the hexagonal prism $\mathbb{B} = (T^2 - T^2) \times [-1,1]$, where T^2 is a 2-simplex. Then $K = T^2 \times [-1/2, 1/2] \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}$ and since $s(K) = 2 = \operatorname{him}(\mathbb{M}^3)$ it follows $s(\mathbb{M}^3) = 2$. Now, $S = T^2 \times \{0\} \subset K$, s. t. $K = S^*$ is the unique completion of S and $s(S) = 2$. However, since $R(S) = \frac{2}{3}$ and $D(S) = 1$ it follows $S^+ = \operatorname{conv}(T^2 \times [-1/3, 1/3]) \neq S^*$.

3. Completeness, Minkowski asymmetry, and Banach-Mazur distance

We recall that the Banach-Mazur distance between two full-dimensional sets $K, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is defined as

$$d_{BM}(K,C) := \inf\{\rho > 0 : K \subset_t A(C) \subset_t \rho K, \text{ with } A \text{ a linear map}\}.$$

Grünbaum in [26] mentioned (but not proved) that $s(K) = \min_{\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{K}^n_0} d_{BM}(K, \mathbb{B})$. For completeness reasons we present a proof of this result and point out that this minimum is attained if $\mathbb{B} = K - K$.

Proposition 3.1. *For any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ it holds*

$$s(K) = \min_{\mathbb{B}\in\mathcal{K}_0^n} d_{BM}(K,\mathbb{B}) = d_{BM}(K, K-K).$$

Proof. Let $\mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$. If $\mathbb{B} \subset K \subset t\mathbb{B}$ with $0 < t < s(K)$, then $K \subset t\mathbb{B} = -t\mathbb{B} \subset -tK$, a contradiction with the definition of $s(K)$. Thus $s(K) \leq \min_{\mathbb{B}\in\mathcal{K}_0^n} d_{BM}(K,\mathbb{B})$.
Conversely, since $K \subset -s(K)K$ it follows

$$\frac{1}{s(K)+1}(K-K) \subset K \subset \frac{s(K)}{s(K)+1}(K-K)$$

and thus $d_{BM}(K, K-K) \leq \frac{s(K)}{s(K)+1}(s(K)+1) = s(K)$, which finishes the proof. □

The following result is taken from [28, Theorem 2]. Even so it is a direct corollary of Proposition 3.1, it gives a more accurate description of the Banach-Mazur distance when restricted to completions in $\mathbb{E}^n$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}$ in $\mathbb{E}^n$. Then $s(K) = d_{BM}(K, \mathbb{B}_2)$.*

Now we state a corollary which generalizes Proposition 3.2 to arbitrary Minkowski space (and sharpens Proposition 3.1).

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\mathbb{M}^n$ be a Minkowski space and K pseudo-complete. Then $s(K) = d_{BM}(K,\mathbb{B})$.*

Proof. If K is pseudo-complete, we know from Lemma 2.4 that it has concentric in- and circumball and from Lemma 2.7 that $r(K)s(K) = R(K)$. Now, using Proposition 3.1 we obtain $d_{BM}(K,\mathbb{B}) \leq \frac{R(K)}{r(K)} = s(K) = \min_{\mathbb{B}\in\mathcal{K}_0^n} d_{BM}(K,\mathbb{B})$ and therefore $s(K) = d_{BM}(K,\mathbb{B})$, as required. □

Similarly as we have done in Remark 2.13 for Theorem 1.1, we should observe that the above corollary shows that the distance of any (pseudo-)complete set and the unit ball of the space does not depend on which unit ball is chosen, as long as the set stays (pseudo-)complete.

Grünbaum in [26] pointed out that the "supermaximality property" (we changed the original "superminimality" because it matches better with our definition of asymmetry) is a very natural property which should be true for a nice asymmetry measure: (A) an asymmetry $\overline{s}$ satisfies the *supermaximality property* if $\overline{s}(K+L) \leq \max\{\overline{s}(K), \overline{s}(L)\}$, $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$. The asymmetry of Minkowski, e. g., satisfies the maximality property. This property characterizes simplices to be the most asymmetric sets for any asymmetry measure in the plane (cf. [26]), but if this is true in higher dimension is still unknown.
Moreover, since simplices may be (almost) subdimensional and may even converge towards a line segment, it is not incontrovertible if this is a "very natural property". As already mentioned above one may also interpret j as an asymmetry measure and argue that the sets with $j(K) = j(\mathbb{M}^n)$ are somehow most asymmetric and the same can be done with the width-inradius ratio or similar coefficients.
As a second property possibly to be fulfilled by a reasonable asymmetry measure Grünbaum suggested the equality case of the supermaximality property: (B) if $\overline{s}(K+L) = \max\{\overline{s}(K), \overline{s}(L)\}$ then $K = -K$, $L = -L$ or K and L are homothetics of each other. However, he did not even clarify if (B) is true for the Minkowski asymmetry, his favourite asymmetry measure. Maybe that was the reason that he also considered the following condition: (B') if $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $\overline{s}$ fulfills the supermaximality, then $\overline{s}(K) = n$ iff K is an n-simplex. Surely, this condition is fulfilled by the Minkowsky asymmetry. Moreover, (B') implies (B) when restricted to $\overline{s}(K+L) = \max\{\overline{s}(K), \overline{s}(L)\} = n$. In fact, assuming w. l. o. g. that $\overline{s}(K+L) = \overline{s}(K) = n$, it

follows from (B') that K and $K+L$ are simplices and from the indecomposability of simplices that K and L must be even homothetic.
We observe that property (B) is false for the Minkowski asymmetry:

Remark 3.4. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ consider the n-dimensional regular simplex T, any Minkowski space $\mathbb{M}^n$ in which T^+ is not complete (e. g. $\mathbb{E}^n$), as well as a completion T^* of T. Since $s(T^+) = s(T^*)$ and*

$$R(T^+ + T^*) + r(T^+ + T^*) = R(T^+) + r(T^+) + R(T^*) + r(T^*) = D(T^+) + D(T^*) = D(T^+ + T^*),$$

Theorem 1.2 implies that $s(T^+ + T^*) = R(T^+ + T^*)/r(T^+ + T^*) = s(T^+) = s(T^*)$, but obviously neither are T^+, T^* symmetric nor homothetics of each other, which contradicts property (B).
With the same arguments one can also show that property (B) does not even hold for $n \geq 3$ when we restrict to $\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{cw}}$ choosing instead of T^+ and T^* two different completions of T (such as the two 3-dimensional Meissner bodies in $\mathbb{E}^3$ or their bodies of evolution in higher dimensions). In 2-space, the Reuleaux triangle is the unique completions of T, but one may easily do the counterproof as above with two less asymmetric bodies of constant width.

References

[1] R. Alexander, The width and diameter of a simplex, *Geometriae Dedicata*, **6** (1977), no. 1, 87–94.
[2] I. Bárány, M. Katchalski and J. Pach, Quantitative Helly-type theorems, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **86** (1982), 109-114.
[3] I. Bárány, M. Katchalski and J. Pach, Hellys theorem with volumes, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **91** (1984), no. 6, 362-365.
[4] A. Belloni, R.M. Freund, On the symmetry function of a convex set, *Mathematical Programming*, **111** (2008), no. 1-2, 57–93.
[5] U. Betke, M. Henk, Estimating sizes of a convex body by successive diameters and widths, *Mathematika* **39** (1992), no. 2, 247-257.
[6] U. Betke, M. Henk, A generalization of Steinhagens theorem, *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg* **63** (1993), 165-176.
[7] V. Boltyanski, H. Martini, Jung's theorem for a pair of Minkowski spaces, *Adv. Geom.* **6** (2006), 645–650.
[8] H. F. Bohnenblust, Convex regions and projections in Minkowski spaces, *Annals of Mathematics* **39** (1938), no. 2, 301–308.
[9] T. Bonnesen, W. Fenchel, *Theorie der konvexen Körper*. Springer, Berlin, 1934, 1974. English translation: *Theory of convex bodies*. Edited by L. Boron, C. Christenson and B. Smith. BCS Associates, Moscow, ID, 1987.
[10] K. Böröczky Jr., M. A. Hernández Cifre and G. Salinas, Optimizing area and perimeter of convex sets for fixed circumradius and inradius, *Monatsh. Math.* **138** (2003), 95–110.
[11] R. Brandenberg, Radii of convex bodies, Ph.D. thesis, Zentrum Mathematik, Technische Universität München, 2002.
[12] R. Brandenberg, Radii of regular polytopes, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **33** (2005), no. 1, 43–55.
[13] R. Brandenberg, S. König, No dimension-independent core-sets for containment under homothetics, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **49** (2013), no. 1, 3–21.
[14] R. Brandenberg, S. König, Sharpening geometric inequalities using computable symmetry measures, arXiv:1310.4368.
[15] L. Caspani, P. L. Papini, On Constant Width Sets in Hilbert Spaces and Around, *J. Convex Anal.* **22** (2015), no. 3.
[16] L. Danzer, B. Grünbaum and V. Klee, Hellys theorem and its relatives, in 1963 Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. VII pp. 101180 Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I.
[17] V. L. Dol'nikov, Jung's constant in l_1^n, *Mat. Zametki* **42** (1987), no. 4, 519-526.
[18] H. G. Eggleston, Measures of asymmetry of convex curves of constant width and restricted radii of curvature, *Quard J. Math. Oxford Ser.* **3** (1952), no. 2, 63–72.
[19] H. G. Eggleston, Sets of constant width, *Convexity*, **7**, 122-135. Cambridge University Press (1969).
[20] H. G. Eggleston, Sets of constant width in finite dimensional Banach spaces, *Israel J. Math.* **3** (1965), 163-172.

[21] B. González, On the ratio between successive radii of a symmetric convex body, *Math. Ineq. Appl.* **16** (2013), 569–576.
[22] N. A. Grigor'ev, Regular simplices inscribed in a cube and Hadamard matrices, S. S. Ryshkov (Ed.), *The geometry of positive quadratic forms* **152** (1983), American Mathematical Soc.
[23] P. Gritzmann, V. Klee, Inner and outer j-radii of convex bodies in finite-dimensional normed spaces, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **7** (1992), 255–280.
[24] P. Gritzmann, V. Klee, Computational complexity of inner and outer j-radii of polytopes in finite-dimensional normed spaces, *Mathematical Programming* **59** (1992), no. 1, 163–213.
[25] H. Groemer, On Complete Convex Bodies, *Geom. Dedicata* **20** (1986), 319–334.
[26] B. Grünbaum, Measure of convex sets, *Convexity, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics*, **7**, 233-270. American Math. Society, Providence (1963).
[27] Q. Guo, H. L. Jin, A note on the extremal bodies of constant width for the Minkowski measure, *Geom. Dedicata* **164** (2013), no. 1, 227–229.
[28] Q. Guo, H. L. Jin, Asymmetry of convex bodies of constant width, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **47** (2012), no. 2, 415–423.
[29] Q. Guo, H. Jin, On the asymmetry for convex domains of constant width, *Commun. Math. Res.* **26** (2010), no. 2, 176-182.
[30] Q. Guo, S. Kaijser, Approximations of convex bodies by convex bodies, *Northeastern Mathematical Journal*, **19** (2003), no. 4, 323–332.
[31] M. Henk, A generalization of Jung's theorem, *Geom. Dedicata* **42** (1992), no. 2, 235–240.
[32] M. Henk, M. A. Hernández Cifre, Intrinsic volumes and successive radii, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **343** (2008), no. 2, 733-742.
[33] H. Jin, Asymmetry for convex body of revolution, *Wuhan University Journal of Natural Sciences* **20** (2015), no. 2, 97–100.
[34] H. Jung, Über die kleinste Kugel, die eine räumliche Figur einschließt, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **123** (1901), 241–257.
[35] K. Leichtweiss, Zwei Extremalprobleme der Minkowski-Geometrie, *Math. Z.* **62** (1955), no. 1, 37–49.
[36] H. Martini, S. Wu, Complete sets need not be reduced in Minkowski spaces, arXiv:1502.07602 (2015).
[37] E. Meissner, Über Punktmengen konstanter Breite, *Vierteljahresschr. Naturforsch. Ges. Zürich* **56** (1911), 42–50.
[38] J. P. Moreno, P. L. Papini, R. R. Phelps, Diametrically maximal and constant width sets in Banach spaces, *Can. J. Math.* **58** (2006), 820-842.
[39] J. P. Moreno, R. Schneider, Diametrically complete sets in Minkowski spaces, *Israel. J. Math.* **191** (2012), 701–720.
[40] J. P. Moreno, R. Schneider, Structure of the Space of Diametrically Complete Sets in a Minkowski Space, *Discrete Comp. Geom.* **48** (2012), 467-486.
[41] M. Naszódi, B. Visy, Sets with a unique extension to a set of constant width, *Discrete Geometry* (A. Bezdek, ed.), 373–380; Marcel Dekker, New York 2003.
[42] G.Y. Perel'man, k-radii of a convex body, *Siberian Mathematical Journal* **28** (1987), no. 4, 665–666.
[43] G. T. Sallee, Sets of constant width, the spherical intersection property and circumscribed balls, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **33** (1986), 369–371.
[44] L. Santaló, Sobre los sistemas completos de desigualdades entre tres elementos de una figura convexa planas, *Math. Notae*, **17** (1961), 82–104.
[45] R. Schneider, Convex Bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski Theory, *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, 1993.
[46] R. Schneider, Stability for some extremal properties of the simplex, *J. Geom.* **96** (2009), 135–148.
[47] P. R. Scott, Sets of constant width and inequalities, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.*, **32** (1981), 345–348.
[48] V. P. Soltan, A theorem on full sets (in Russian), *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **234** (1977), 320–322. Engl. transl.: *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **18** (1977), 680–682.
[49] B. Szökefalvi-Nagy, Ein Satz über Parallelverschiebungen konvexer Körper, *Acta Sci. Math.* **15** (1954), no. 34, 169-177.
[50] P. Steinhagen, Über die größte Kugel in einer konvexen Punktmenge, *Abh. Hamb. Sem. Hamburg*, **1** (1921), 15–26.
[51] S. Vrecica, A note on sets of constant width, *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.)* **29** (1981), 289-291.

Zentrum Mathematik, Technische Universität München, Boltzmannstr. 3, 85747 Garching bei München, Germany
E-mail address: brandenb@ma.tum.de
E-mail address: bg.merino@tum.de